

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION	1 NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	1
09/981,43	1 .	10/16/2001	Michael T. Andreas	MTI-31555	5688	
31870 WUVT	7590 E UIDSCU	06/22/200 BOECK DUDEK S	•	EXAMINER KORNAKOV, MIKHAIL		
555 EA	ST WELLS		s.C.			
SUITE 1900 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	•
WIIL W	AUREE, W	1 33202	,	1746		•
				NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
				06/22/2007	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jpolmatier@whdlaw.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/981,431	ANDREAS, MICHAEL T.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Michael Kornakov	1746		

	Michael Kornakov	1746					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 June 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff pitice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later for the contract of the contract	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL		<b>.</b>					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
B. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause				
(a) X They raise new issues that would require further co							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	·	••					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **		_				
4. $\square$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
$5$ . $\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	•						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	•				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,9,10,16-20,22-24,27,28,30-37,42-4</u>	15 50-60 62-66 70 71 77 139-144 a	nd 146-156					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8,21,25,29,47,74	75,78,79 and 145.						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	<del></del>						
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a				
IO. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•		•				
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13.  Other:							
	10 m = 1						
	M. COPIARON	Michael Kornakov Primary Examiner	•				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Continuation of 3. NOTE: a) although the presence of a buffer was previously indicated in dependent claims 16 and 27, the limitation reciting "an amount of buffering agent for a pH of about 5-6.5" has not been previously presented in claims and introducing this limitation into claims 1, 18, 28, 55, 60, 62, 139-143, 146, 149, 152 would require at least new consideration and most likely an additional search. Furthermore, this limitation would have changed the scope of dependent claims, and thus, would have required at the very least new consideration whether the dependent claims as amended are in compliance with the written description requirement.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument presented by Applicant is based entirely on the difference in the pH between the amended claims as currently proposed and the reference to Pregozen applied by the Examiner as a sole reference to the independent claims. As such, Applicants argument is entirely based on the proposed amendment that has not been entered. The issue of pH was previously addressed by the Examiner, since Applicant claims the range of "about 5..." therefore such range allows some tolerance on the lower side, and as such the difference between the pH of Pregozen's composition and the claimed pH presents a minute difference and the composition of Pregozen is reasonably expected to possess the properties similar to those as instantly claimed.